

BARBARA J. PARKER, City Attorney, CABN 069722  
 RYAN RICHARDSON, Special Counsel, CABN 223548  
 KEVIN P. MCLAUGHLIN, Supervising Deputy City Attorney, CABN 251477  
 BRIGID S. MARTIN, Special Counsel, CABN 231705  
 One Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor  
 Oakland, California 94612  
 Telephone: (510) 238-3601  
 Facsimile: (510) 238-6500  
 Email: BMartin@oaklandcityattorney.org

Attorneys for Defendant, CITY OF OAKLAND

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,	)	No. 00-cv-04599 WHO
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	<b>DEFENDANT CITY OF OAKLAND’S</b>
	)	<b>RESPONSE TO MOTION TO</b>
v.	)	<b>CONSIDER WHETHER CASES</b>
	)	<b>SHOULD BE RELATED IN</b>
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	<b>SUPPORT OF RELATING CASE</b>
	)	<b>NO. 21-cv-02881 TSH TO CASE NO.</b>
Defendants.	)	<b>20-cv-03866 JCS</b>

COLES, et al., ) No. 03-cv-02961 TEH

Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

ILWU Local 10, et al., ) No. 03-cv-02962 TEH

Plaintiffs,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

SPALDING, et al., ) No. 11-cv-02867 TEH

Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	

1	v.	)	
2	CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	
3	Defendants.	)	
4	CAMPBELL, et al.	)	No. 11-cv-05498 JST
5	Plaintiffs,	)	
6	v.	)	
7	CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	
8	Defendants.	)	
9	ANTI POLICE-TERROR PROJECT,	)	No. 20-cv-03866 JCS
10	et al.,	)	
11	Plaintiffs,	)	
12	v.	)	
13	CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	
14	Defendants.	)	
15	GAFFETT, et al.,	)	No. 21-cv-02881 TSH
16	Plaintiffs,	)	
17	v.	)	
18	CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,	)	
19	Defendants.	)	

Plaintiffs in *Gaffett v. City of Oakland, et al.*, C-21-02881 TSH ask the Court to consider pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12 whether *Gaffett* is related to the six other above-captioned cases. For the reasons set forth herein, the City supports relating *Gaffett* to *Anti Police-Terror Project, et al., v. City of Oakland, et al.*, C-20-03866 JCS. The City opposes relating *Gaffett* to the remaining five captioned cases.

Cases are related when (1) the actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the

1 cases are conducted before different Judges. L.R. 3-12. *Gaffett* and *Anti Police-*  
2 *Terror Project (APTP)* meet this definition of related cases.

3 *Gaffett* and *APTP* are both cases brought by protestors challenging the  
4 Oakland Police Department's (OPD) handling of protests and demonstrations in  
5 Oakland between May 29, 2020, and June 1, 2020. *Gaffett* also alleges claims  
6 against the Alameda County Sheriff's Office (ACSO) for conduct in Oakland during  
7 the same time period, while *APTP* alleges that OPD "call[ed] on its mutual aid  
8 network of police municipalities to further carry out its constitutionally improper  
9 tactics." C-20-03866 JCS, Dkt. 71, Am. Compl., ¶8. ACSO provided mutual aid to  
10 OPD on each date between May 29 and June 1, 2020. C-20-03866 JCS, Dkt. 36-1,  
11 Allison Decl., ¶11. Thus, OPD and ACSO conduct over a single four-day period in  
12 the same location during the same events is at the heart of both cases.

13 In addition, both *Gaffett* and *APTP* purport to be class actions and seek class  
14 certification. *Gaffett* defines its putative class as "as all persons who have in the past  
15 participated, presently are participating, or may in the future participate in, or be  
16 present at, demonstrations and crowd events within the City of Oakland in the  
17 exercise of their rights of free speech, assembly, association, petition, and of the  
18 press." C-21-02881 TSH, Dkt. 6, Compl., ¶89. *APTP* seeks to represent "[a]ll  
19 demonstrators who participated and/or intended to participate in the protests  
20 beginning on May 29, 2020 in Oakland." C-20-03866 JCS, Dkt. 71, Am. Compl., ¶  
21 128. Thus, *APTP* putative class members would necessarily also be *Gaffett* class  
22 members.

23 Finally, plaintiffs in both *Gaffett* and *APTP* seek the same type of injunctive  
24 relief prohibiting OPD and ACSO from using certain force or tools in responding to  
25 crowds in Oakland. *Gaffett* seeks "injunctive relief in the form of an order  
26 prohibiting OPD and ACSO from using chemical weapons, explosive grenades, and  
27 impact munitions in crowds." C-21-02881 TSH, Dkt. 6, Compl., ¶14. The Court in  
28

1 *APTP* has already issued a preliminary injunction limiting OPD's uses of force and  
 2 weapons, and imposing special rules for OPD's requests for and employment of  
 3 mutual aid resources for protests and demonstrations. C-20-03866 JCS, Dkt. 82,  
 4 Am. Preliminary Injunction (Oct. 28, 2020).

5 The June 18, 2020 Temporary Restraining Order (Dkt. 34), July 29, 2020  
 6 Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 52), and October 28, 2020 Amended Preliminary  
 7 Injunction (Dkt. 82) all issued in *APTP* in the last year reflect a substantial amount  
 8 of work by the Honorable Joseph C. Spero, issuing each order following significant  
 9 litigation. Having a different judge now embark on what would be substantially the  
 10 same inquiry and possibly issue a parallel or overlapping injunction would be an  
 11 unduly burdensome duplication of labor and could result in conflicting orders and  
 12 confusion. It makes the most sense to have a single injunction or set of injunctions  
 13 emanate from a single judge to avoid unduly burdening judicial resources and to  
 14 ensure consistency and clarity in injunctive orders.

15 Similarly, relating *Gaffett* to the other above-captioned cases filed prior to  
 16 *APTP*—all of which are assigned to different Judges than the Judge in *APTP*—  
 17 would also likely result in an unduly burdensome duplication of labor or conflicting  
 18 results.

19 Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein, the City of Oakland agrees that  
 20 *Gaffett* and *APTP* are related pursuant to L.R. 3-12, and opposes relating *Gaffett*  
 21 with the other above-captioned cases.

22 Respectfully submitted,

23 Dated: May 1, 2021

BARBARA J. PARKER, City Attorney  
 KEVIN P. MCLAUGHLIN, Supervising Deputy City  
 Attorney  
 BRIGID S. MARTIN, Special Counsel

26  
 27 By: /s/ BRIGID MARTIN  
 Attorneys for Defendants  
 CITY OF OAKLAND  
 28